Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BM620 .H8
Hunterberg, Max, 1883- MAIN
The crucified Jew : Who crucified Jesus?
3 9967 00082 6656

LIBRARY
of the
Theological Seminary
of the
Evangelical Lutheran Church
AT CHICAGO
MAYWOOD, ILLINOIS

Division

Class

Shelf

Ac. Vol. 19,043

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T3-BUN-507

THE CRUCIFIED JEW

Who Crucified Jesus?

BY

MAX HUNTERBERG

"Let there be light." (Genesis I: 3)

NEW YORK
BLOCH PUBLISHING CO.
1927

14970

COPYRIGHT, 1927
BY BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

BM620
.H8

PREFACE

At one of the numerous occasions on which I attended service in a Christian church, my eyes rested on a large book which lay on the pulpit. I realized that it was the Bible, the Torah, the product of Jewish genius, written by Jews from cover to cover.

The minister prayed to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He read passages from the history of Israel, the history of my people, and quoted from the Jewish prophets or from the epistles of St. Paul, the Jew. The choir and congregation chanted the psalms of the Jewish King, accompanied by the strains of the organ.

At a sign from the pastor the congregation rose, and with beaming faces, sang: "Jesus, lover of my soul," "Jesus died for me," "His precious blood He shed for me."

My heart was filled with joy at the thought that I, as a Jew, was the only person in the congregation who could claim the distinction of being of the same race, blood and faith as Jesus, the crucified Jew, "who,

being the holiest amongst the mighty, the mightiest among the holy," to quote a German writer, "lifted with his pierced hand Empires off their hinges, turned the stream of centuries out of its channel, and still governs the ages." Then I blessed the day that I was born a Jew, that I am a descendant of a race which gave to the world a Bible, a God, and a Saviour.

As I listened to that pastor arraigning the Jews for their rejection and crucifixion of Jesus, I conceived the idea of preparing the following pages, which I have spoken from various Christian pulpits both in England and in this country, and placing them in book form, in order to prove the falsity of the conception held by many Christians that the Jews crucified Jesus.

MAX HUNTERBERG

New York
March, 1927

THE CRUCIFIED JEW

THE CRUCIFIED JEW

CHAPTER I

SOCRATES was tried by five hundred judges, every one of them a Greek. More than half of them condemned the great philosopher to drink the poisonous hemlock. Yet, ask any schoolboy who killed Socrates and he will never answer: "The Greeks."

Ask this same schoolboy who assassinated Julius Caesar and his answer will not be: "The Romans," but "Brutus, Cassius and the others." Ask him who sent Giordano Bruno to the stake, and, whatever his answer, it will not be: "The Italians." Ask him who shot Abraham Lincoln, and it will never occur to him to say: "The Americans." But ask this same schoolboy who killed Jesus, and his immediate, positive answer will be—not "The Romans"—but "The Jews."

The Christian schoolboy goes a step fur-

ther and tells a Jewish boy of his class in the presence of other boys that his (the Jewish boy's) father killed Jesus. The Jewish boy, who has not the least knowledge of the circumstances, stares about him bewildered. His face turns crimson. He feels ashamed and embarrassed. His father, whom he loves and honors, is accused of murder, and coming home from school he asks his father if he killed Jesus—a crime perpetrated nineteen hundred years ago.

"A people, who," as Alfred Martin says in his book "The World's Great Religions," "are victimized by prejudice so deep and inhuman that even little children of refined Jewish parents have come home from school crying because of the abuse heaped upon them by the children of 'Christian' parents, whose finest religious inheritance is from Moses and his successors" are made answerable in perpetuity, apparently.

That this situation is not exaggerated is attested by Dr. Alfred Williams Anthony, Chairman of the Committee on Good-Will

Between Jews and Christians, who says in his essay on "The Jewish Problem": "There are Jewish fathers and mothers in this—our Christian—country who bitterly complain that Christian children at school taunt their children that they (the Jews) killed Jesus."

It is the persistence of this misconception throughout the centuries which has been the most potent factor in the stimulation of world-wide anti-Semitism. The emotion aroused by the story of the crucifixion of Jesus as it has been handed down has swept away whatever rational attitude Christians may have been willing to adopt toward the people who gave them their Saviour. The story of the crucifixion has become as integral a part of the Christian's education as the story of the Resurrection. In the very early stages when the Christian child is being taught the history of him who counseled love for neighbor, there is presented to him in all its graphic, vivid, indelible colors the tale of the crucified Jesus

—crucified, the lesson goes on, by the Jews.

The increasing attempts that have been made recently in the United States to foster good-will between Jew and Gentile have rarely gone to the root of the deep-set animosity which exists on the part of the Christian toward the Jew. Infrequently, the story of the crucifixion has been ignored, as no doubt it may be, between the type of men represented by those high-minded Christians who have set themselves the task of fostering good-will. But as long as the crux of the problem is avoided, there can be no thorough understanding of the difficulties that beset a genuine break-down of antipathy. Who killed Jesus? That is the question that must be faced by every earnest student of good-will between Jews and Christians. To the Jews the question is a superfluous one. Very few Christians are able or willing to give the correct answer to the question.

Perhaps Benjamin Disraeli, a British Prime Minister, and novelist, has given the

most concise and thorough phrasing of the problem involved in his novel, "Tancred."

A Jewess is discussing the crucifixion with a Christian.

"Let me ask you. You think that the present state of my race is penal?" questioned the Jewess.

Tancred nodded assent.

"Why do you?" she asked.

"It is the punishment ordained for their rejection and crucifixion of the Messiah."

"Where is it ordained?"

" 'Upon our heads and upon our children be his blood.' "

"The criminals said that, not the judge. Is it a principle of your jurisprudence to permit the guilty to assign their own punishment? They might deserve a severer one. Why should they transfer any of the infliction to posterity? What evidence have you that Omnipotence accepted the offer? It is not so announced in your histories. Your evidence is the reverse. He whom you acknowledge as omnipotent prayed to

Jehovah to forgive them on account of their ignorance. But, admit that the offer was accepted, which in my opinion is blasphemy, is the cry of a rabble at a public execution to bind a nation. Yet another question! My grandfather is a Bedouin sheik, chief of one of the most powerful tribes of the desert. My mother was his daughter. He is a Jew; his whole tribe are Jews. Were they in Jerusalem at the crucifixion and does the shout of the rabble touch them? Yet my mother married a Hebrew of the cities, and a man, too, fit to sit on the throne of King Solomon; and yet a little Christian Yahoor with a round hat, who sells figs at Smyrna, will cross the street if he sees her, lest he should be contaminated by the blood of one who crucified his Saviour. It is not to be found in your books. They were written by Jews, men far too well acquainted with their subjects to indite such tales of the Philistines as these!"

"I do not see," said Tancred, "that the penal dispersion of the Hebrew nation is at

such contingencies," said Tancred. "The subject is too high for me to touch with all essential to the great object of the Christian scheme. If a Jew did not exist, that would equally have been obtained."

"And what do you hold to be the essential object of the Christian scheme?"

"The Expiation!"

"Ah!" said the Jewess, "that is a great idea. Shaped as you Christians offer the doctrine, it loses none of its sublimity. A sacrificial Mediator, born from the chosen house of the chosen people, appointed before all time, and purifying by his atoning blood, the myriads that preceded and the myriads that will follow us, without distinction of creed or clime, this is what you believe. I understand this much: the human race is saved; and, without the apparent agency of a Hebrew prince, it could not have been saved. Now tell me: suppose the Jews had not prevailed upon the Romans to crucify Jesus, what would have become of the Atonement?"

"I cannot permit myself to contemplate

speculation. I must not even consider an event that had been pre-ordained by the Creator of the world for countless ages."

"Ah," said the Jewess, "pre-ordained by the Creator of the world for countless ages! Where then was the inexpiable crime of those who fulfilled the beneficent intention? The holy race supplied the victim and immolators. And with such a doctrine, that embraces all space and time; nay, more, chaos and eternity; with divine persons for the agents, and the redemption of the whole family of man for the subject; you can mix up the miserable prosecution of a single race! And this is practical, not doctrinal Christianity. It is not found in your Christian books, which were all written by Jews; it must have been made by some of those Churches to which you have referred me. Persecute us! Why, if you believe what you profess, you should kneel to us! You raise statues to the hero who saves a country. We have saved the human race and you persecute us for doing it."

CHAPTER II

PALM SUNDAY sees devout Christians carrying palms to the church. They never realize that they are observing the memorable Jewish procession, the cordial greeting accorded to Christ by his own people.

The wide-spread belief that the Jews crucified Jesus is bolstered up by the general indifference to the fact of Jesus' Jewishness. It seems naive to remark that Jesus was thoroughly grounded in rabbinic lore, and was merely a product of the Jewish environment of his day, paralleling in teaching and practice the Jewish teacher, Hillel. That bigoted Christians believe Jesus to have been the first 'Christian' is no more amazing than the sincere conviction that the Jews staged the crucifixion.

I am reminded of a certain minister who, during a Palm Sunday, took his text from John XII: 13, which refers to the Jews who

"took branches of palm trees and went forth to meet him."

Taking the foregoing as his text, the pastor continued: "And on the very next Friday, they (the Jews) took chains and strong cudgels of reeds and scourges of the most ingenious sort, perfectly adapted to hurt, and a great wooden cross and thick wooden nails—the Bible calls them nails; but if you will observe our modern carpenters fitting joints of woods together with great pins an inch in diameter and four in length, you will have a better view of what they took than the picture that the word 'nail' gives you.

"And they took this cross, and the Saviour carried it. And they took vinegar and they took gall, and they took angry voices, and they took all the implements of crucifixion."

There is no evidence in the Gospels to show that the Jews who "took branches of palm trees and went forth to meet him," on the next Friday took their Messiah to

Calvary and made him carry the cross. What reason had they to take their Messiah to Calvary to crucify him? Did the pastor realize that he unconsciously uttered from the pulpit the greatest lie in history?

It is the purpose of this study of the events leading up to and the causes of the crucifixion of Jesus to prove from the pages of the Gospel that Jesus was loved by the Jews, hated and rejected by the ruling priestly family, condemned to death by a Roman court for treason against Rome, and nailed to the Roman cross by four Roman soldiers.

Jesus was born a Jew. He lived and died as a Jew. As a rabbi he preached in the synagogue and in the Temple. He was addressed as Master (which means rabbi in Hebrew) by his disciples, and by the people. That Jesus was acknowledged as rabbi can be seen from John (III: 1): "There was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus. The same came to Jesus by night and said

unto him, 'Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God."

Luke (II: 21-25) gives further evidence, if such be needed, of Jesus being brought up in the tradition of his people: "And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcision of the child, his name was called Jesus. And when the days of her purification, according to the law of Moses, was accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, as it is written in the law of the Lord. Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy unto the Lord. And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle doves and two young pigeons."

In his discourse on "Hillel and Jesus," the late Rabbi Krauskopf remarks: "Where so much detailed knowledge is crowded into the time immediately preceding and succeeding the birth of Jesus, and yet more into the last year, or the last three years of his life, is it not strange that a complete

blank should span the opening and closing periods of his life? Is it not strange that for thirty long years not a trace should be found of a divinely born and of a divinely commissioned Son of God? What did he do during all these thirty years? Where did he live? How did he live? Where did he study? Who were his masters? To all these questions there is no answer. All the records are silent. Not all the miracles told of the birth and death of Jesus are as astounding as this silence of thirty years."

And yet it seems as though this period might be illuminated by what may legitimately be regarded as Jesus' public utterances and public work. His moral lessons, his intense Jewishness, his style of teaching, seem strongly to indicate that he must have spent many years in Jerusalem, must have sat at the feet of the celebrated teachers of that time, Hillel, or his son, Gamaliel, or both; must have been a member of their sect, the Pharisees; must have imbibed their intense national spirit and patriotism, and

their eagerness to see their mother land freed from the oppression of the Roman.

Any record of Jesus' activity and beliefs must be based exclusively on the Gospel. Even that volume tells us that Jesus observed the Sabbath, the Passover, and all the other festivals.

Matthew (XXVI: 17-20) describes the Passover, and says: "Now, the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, the disciples came to Jesus saying unto him: 'Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee the passover?' And he said, 'Go into the city to such a man and say unto him, the Master said: 'I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples.' And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them and they made ready the Passover."

Jesus fulfilled tradition by breaking the Matzoh (unleavened bread), by pronouncing the benediction over the cup of wine and by singing hymns. To quote further from Mark (XIV: 22-26): "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread and blessed and

broke it and gave it to them . . . And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them and they all drank of it . . . And when they had sung a hymn went out onto the Mount of Olives."

Jesus attended the Synagogue every Sabbath day and was called upon to read a portion of the Torah, we are told in Luke (IV: 16-23): "And he came to Nazareth where he had been brought up, and as his custom was he went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written: 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath annointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, to set at libery those that are bruised.' And he closed the book and he gave it again to the minister and sat down, and the eyes of all them that were in the Synagogue were fastened upon

him. And began to say unto them: 'This day is the Scripture fulfilled in your eyes.' And all bare him witness and wondered at his gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, 'Is not this Joseph's son?' "

Jesus never condoned the profanation of the Sabbath. When his disciples were rebuked for plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath, he did not deny such such was forbidden, but excused it on the ground of necessity. (Matt. XII: 1-5)

One of the most vital and significant opinions of Jesus is recorded in Mark (XII: 28-34), where Jesus comments on the Unity of God.

"And one of the Scribes came and having heard them reasoning together and perceiving that he (Jesus) had answered them well, asked him: Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God

with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. And the Scribe said unto him, "Well, Rabbi thou hast said the truth, for there is one God, and there is none other but He, and to love Him with all the heart, and all the understanding, and with all the soul and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is more than all the whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, 'Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God.' "

Some time ago ex-Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany wrote a series of theological articles in which he declared that "Jesus was crucified by the Jews" for introducing a new standard of ethics. "This new stan-

dard," says the ex-Kaiser, "finding supreme expression in the Sermon on the Mount, replaces the old obsolete prescriptions of the Mosaic law. Because the principles taught by Jesus which they rejected, annihilated their code of ethics and morals as useless, they crucified him."

Matthew seems to give a different view of Jesus.

"And behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, 'Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God, but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' He saith unto him, 'which?' Jesus said, 'Thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, honor thy father and thy mother, and thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself.'" (XIX: 16-19)

Apparently Jesus was not intent upon re-

jecting the "obsolete prescriptions" of the Mosaic law.

The Sermon on the Mount corroborates this last sentence. "Think not," he said, "that I am come to destroy the Torah or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. V: 17-19)

Tolstoy has a passage in his book "My Religion" which amply demonstrates that the "new standard" which Jesus promulgated in his Sermon on the Mount, has, with few exceptions, a parallel in the Bible and in the sayings of the rabbis.

"Not long ago," writes Tolstoy, "I was reading the fifth chapter of Matthew (Ser-

mon on the Mount) with a Hebrew rabbi. At nearly every verse, the rabbi said: 'That is in the Bible, or that is in the Talmud,' and he showed me in the Bible and in the Talmud sentences very like the declaration of the Sermon on the Mount. But when we reached the verse about non-resistance of evil, the rabbi did not say, 'This is also in the Talmud,' but he asked me with a cynical smile, 'Do the Christians obey this command? Do they turn the other cheek?' I have had nothing to answer in reply, especially as in that particular time, Christians not only were not turning the other cheek, but were smiting the Jews on both cheeks.

"But I was interested in knowing if there was anything similar in the Bible or in the Talmud and I asked him about it. 'No,' he said, 'But tell me, do the Christians obey this law?' By this question he told me that the presence in the Christian doctrine of a commandment which no one observed, rejected by Christians as impracticable, is

simply an avowal of the foolishness and nullity of that law."

Besides this famous precept, "Whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also," to which I presume the ex-Kaiser was alluding when he spoke of the "supreme expression" in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus himself did not mean it literally, for he found it impracticable in his own experience. When an officer of the high priest struck Jesus on the face with the palm of his hand, Jesus did not turn the other cheek, but protested against the assault. "If I have spoken evil," said Jesus to the officer, "bear witness to the evil. If well, why smitest thou me."

Jesus is quoted as having urged the people and his disciples to adhere to the teachings of the Scribes and Pharisees, who were "the pillars of traditional laws."

"Then spake Jesus to the multitude and to his disciples. 'The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and

do, but do not after their works, for they say and do not.'" (Matt. XXIII: 2-3)

Even after the death of Jesus, the apostles "observed Sabbath and holidays, circumcision and sacrifice, temple worship and Levitical purity in common with all orthodox Jews."

The "Lord's Prayer" which Jesus taught His disciples and which is now a standard prayer in Christendom is but an adaptation of a portion in the Jewish liturgy.

Certain Christian theologians are fond of referring to Jesus as the first Christian. Others suffice it to assert that Jesus prepared the way for the first Christian. That Jesus himself was not the founder of Christianity is well illustrated in Matthew (X: 5-6), in the passage in which Jesus forbids his disciples to preach the Kingdom of God to non-Jews. "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into the city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But

rather go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matt. 10: 5-6)

At another time Jesus turned away from the plea of a Gentile woman who asked that her daughter be healed: "I am not sent," he said, "but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matt. XV: 22-24)

CHAPTER III

How was Jesus regarded among the people of his time? What attitude did the priests and the populace adopt to the man whose humility was his outstanding characteristic?

The late Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, President of the Hebrew Union College, in speaking of the period in which Jesus lived, said:

"Jesus, the living man, was the teacher and practicer of the tenderest love for God and man, the paragon of piety, humility and self-surrender; his very failings were born of overflowing goodness and sympathy with the afflicted. He was one of the best and truest sons of the synagogue. Did he not say, 'I have not come to destroy the law but to fulfill it?' He had nothing of the rigidity of the schoolman, none of the pride of the philosopher and recluse, nor even the implacable zeal of the ancient prophet to

excite the popular wrath; he came only to weep with the sorrowing, to lift up the downtrodden, to save and to heal. He was a man of the people; *why should the people have raised the cry 'Crucify him'* against him whose only object in life was to bring home the message of God's love to the humblest of his children? None can read the parables and verdicts of the Nazarene and not be thrilled with the joy of truth unspelled before. There is wonderful music in the voice which stays an angry crowd, saying 'Let him that is without sin cast the first stone!' that speaks the words, 'Be like children, and you are not far from the Kingdom of God?' "

Jesus was invited to the tables of Pharisees and though like other popular teachers, criticized the conduct of some of them, nevertheless accepted their hospitality (Luke VII: 36; XI: 37). Some of the Pharisees, to show their admiration for Jesus, warned him of Herod's intention of killing him. "There came several Pharisees,

saying unto him, Get thee and depart hence, for Herod will kill thee" we are told by Luke (XIII: 31)

Rabbi Jesus had friends among the doctors of law; and Scribes and Pharisees were among his followers. (Matthew VIII: 19) How many Christians consider that the marriage at Cana, Galilee, at which Jesus, his mother and his disciples were invited guests, was a Jewish wedding?

The wealthy Zacchaeus, Nicodemus, a prominent Pharisee, Joseph of Arimathea, a councillor, Nathaniel, Lazarus and his two sisters, Mary and Martha, at whose house Jesus was a frequent guest, Mary Magdalene, Joana, the wife of Herod's steward, Suzana and Salome were Jews and Jewesses, and among his most loyal and devoted friends.

Jesus was loved and idolized by the Jewish masses, and crowds thronged to hear him wherever he went. "And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom,

and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. And there followed him great multitudes of (Jewish) people from Galilee and from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem and from Judea and from beyond the Jordan," we are told in Matthew. (IV: 23-25)

The synagogues of which the Pharisees were the leaders were always open to the eminent rabbi. (Matt. IX: 35) Jewish children were blessed by him. (Mark X: 15-16) Jewish women ministered unto him. (Luke VIII: 3)

The woman who "lifted her voice and said unto Jesus, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked,' " was a Jewess. (Luke XI: 27-28) The woman who washed Jesus' feet with her tears and wiped them with her hair was a Jewess. (Luke VII: 37-38) The woman who annointed the head of Jesus with "very precious ointment" was a Jewess. (Mark XIV: 3)

On the other hand, Jesus was extremely

devoted to his people, whom he called "the salt of the earth, the light of the world." (Matt. V: 13-14) In his remarkable dialogue with the Samaritan woman, Jesus said: "Salvation comes from the Jews." (John IV: 22) It was the fact that Jesus could not tolerate the priestly misrule and traffic in the Temple which has been misinterpreted as an aversion on Jesus' part for his people.

"Like every loyal Galilean," says Rabbi Enelow in his "Jewish View of Jesus," "Jesus was devoted to Jerusalem. It was part of every good Jew's life to make periodic pilgrimages to the capital and the Temple. No doubt Jesus in his youth made such pilgrimages, and we can imagine what a deep impression the life of the capital must have made on his quick, poetic mind. At first, the glory of it may well have captivated him. But as his knowledge grew fuller, as his perception deepened, as he realized the meaning of the intrigues, and ambitions, and wishes, and

hypocrisies that centered about the Temple, how keen must have been the pang of his disappointment! And when from the riotous and pompous whirl of Jerusalem he returned to the quiet hills of Galilee, how must his heart have mourned over the corruption of the capital!

"Such experience led finally to his clash with the Temple forces and denunciation of the pompous and hypocritical Temple piety. It was like the indignation of Elijah at the court of Ahab, like that of Amos at Bethel, or of Jeremiah at the Jerusalem of his day. It was not the denunciation of hate but the denunciation of love, of the idealist against the corruptors of the city he had loved and dreamed about and idealized from afar."

"It is astonishing," said Rev. Dr. S. M. Shoemaker, Jr., in a sermon at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, "the manner in which Jesus deliberately ignored Rome. His country was subject to a militaristic power whose officials had control over the

entire life of the Jews. Rome appointed the high priest. Tax-collectors gathered tribute for the Empire. Jesus belonged to the race that loved freedom and hated tyranny to an extent rarely equalled in history. They looked for a political Messiah to free them. And again and again they revolted against the invader, with terrible consequences to themselves. Jesus says nothing of revolt, nothing of the humiliation of their national pride, nothing of the wickedness of Rome. He set the obligation to God sharply over against the obligation to Caesar, as though there might be a conflict between the two."

The question then arises: Who were Jesus' enemies? There were in Jerusalem two powerful leaders who from personal and political motives conspired against Jesus: Joseph Caiaphas, the high priest of the Temple of Jerusalem, and Annas the former high priest and father-in-law of Caiaphas. They saw in the teachings of Jesus a danger to their wealth and power. Seven members of the house of Annas held

the office of high priest of the Temple of Jerusalem. None of these priests were descendants of Aaron, nor were they elected by the people, but had obtained the office from the Roman governors for large money bribes.

The members of the house of Annas were of the Sadducean sect, the conservative party and aristocracy of Judea, who cared little for tradition, ridiculed the popular beliefs in the resurrection of the dead and in the existence of angels, while they treated with contempt many of the traditions held sacred by the masses. The Sadducees held the highest political and civil authority next to the Roman governor himself.

When Jesus made his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, when he came to celebrate the feast of Passover, he caused a great stir among the people, especially among the thousands of pilgrims who also had come for the Passover festival.

"And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down

branches from the trees, and strewed them in the way. And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest. And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this? And the multitude said, This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee." (Matt. XXI: 8-11)

It was on this memorable visit that Jesus denounced the traffic in the Temple and came into conflict with the temple authorities, the ruling priestly family.

"And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that bought and sold in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money chargers and the seats of them that sold doves, and said unto them, 'It is written: My house shall be called the house of prayer, but you have made it a den of thieves.' " (Matt. XXI: 12-13)

Immediately the hostility of the chief priests was aroused, when they heard this

attack upon their misrule, and that, too, in the presence of the multitude. They realized that the influence of Jesus might kindle a popular outburst which must inevitably result in the fall of the house of Annas, and bring upon them the vengeance of Rome, and the destruction of Jerusalem.

In describing the events that followed this incident, John (XI: 47-53), says: "Then gathered the chief priests a council and said 'What do we? For this man does many miracles. If we let him thus alone all men will believe in him; and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and our nation.' And one of them named Caiaphas, being the high priest for the same year said unto them, 'Ye know nothing at all. Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.' Then from that day forth they took council together for to put him to death."

The chief priests dared not have Jesus

arrested in the light of day lest they arouse the anger of the people against them. Accordingly, Jesus was arrested by Roman soldiers at midnight, when all the people of Jerusalem were asleep, and was led to the palace of the former high priest, Annas.

It is evident from the Gospel of John that no Jewish trial took place at the palace of the high priest. Telling us in detail what happened from the time Jesus was taken from Annas to Caiaphas, and from Caiaphas to the Roman court, John (XVIII: 12-29) reports: "Then the captain and officers took Jesus and bound him, and led him away to Annas first, for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, who was the high priest that same year. Annas then asked Jesus of his disciples and of his doctrines. Jesus answered him, 'I have spoken openly to the world. I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple whither the Jews always resort, and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? Ask

them which heard me, that I have said unto them, behold, they know what I said.'

"And when he had thus spoken, one of the officers which stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, saying, 'Answerest thou the high priest so?' Jesus answered him, 'If I have spoken evil, hear witness to the evil, but if well, why smitest thou me?'

"Now Annas had sent him bound into Caiaphas the high priest. And Simon Peter stood and warmed himself. They said therefore unto him, 'Art thou also one of his disciples?' He denied it, and said, 'I am not.' One of the servants of the high priest, his kinsman, whose ear Peter cut off, said, 'Did not I see thee in the garden with him?' Peter denied again and immediately the cock crew. Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the (Roman) hall of judgment, and it was early, and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover."

Assuming that there was a trial in the palace of the high priest, its proceedings were in every particular in opposition to the Jewish law.

In the first place Jesus was tried on the night of the Passover. It is forbidden by Jewish law to transact business or to conduct trials on the Sabbath or on the festivals. Jewish law also prohibited the opening of trials at night. The Sanhedrin could not hold a session before six o'clock in the morning. Capital cases had to be tried in the court called 'Lischhath Hagazeth,' adjoining the Temple. But the trial of Jesus took place at the residence of the high priest.

In the second place, capital cases had to be brought before the Sanhedrin, the Jewish Supreme Court, composed of seventy-one members. Furthermore, the Sanhedrin had been dissolved during the time in which Jesus' trial is supposed to have occurred. In his volume, on "The Christ," John Remsburg declares that "Jesus could not have

been tried before it; and before its jurisdiction ceased, he could not have had a subsequent trial before Pilate."

The witnesses in capital cases, according to Jewish law, were carefully scrutinized and were at once dismissed if they were suspected of any personal interest in the suit. On entering the precincts of the court, witnesses were strictly cautioned to give nothing but true evidence, whether for or against the accused, the judge saying to them: "Perchance you intend to speak from mere rumor, or perhaps you are not aware that we shall examine you with cross words and questions—searching words. Know then that trials wherein the life of a man hangs in the balance are not trials concerning worldly goods."

The Gospel of Mark (XIV: 55) says that "the chief priests sought for false witnesses against Jesus to put him to death, but found none." None of the Jewish people of Jerusalem would bear false witness against the gentle rabbi, the friend of the

poor and the outcast, who with outstretched arms pleaded to his people: "Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden and I will give you rest."

At last Caiaphas procured a couple of temple employees, but even these false witnesses contradicted each other. "At the last came two false witnesses and said, 'This fellow said: "I am able to destroy the temple of God, and build it in three days." ' " (Matthew XXVI: 61)

According to Jewish law, a judge cannot act as prosecutor. In the trial of Jesus, his arch-enemy Caiaphas took the part of both prosecutor and judge. A Jewish court could not question a prisoner; a prisoner could not be convicted upon his own confession of guilt. Jesus was questioned by Caiaphas, and, apparently, sentenced upon the testimony of his own confession—a thoroughly illegal procedure.

In his trial before the high priest Jesus had no counsel to defend him, and all the judges were unanimous in convicting him.

Maimonides, in commenting upon this phase of Jewish law, says: "If none of the judges defend the culprit, and if all pronounce him guilty, having no defender in the court, the verdict of guilt is invalid, and the sentence of death cannot be executed."

Doctor Geikie, too, in his "Life of Christ" says: "The accused was in all cases to be held innocent till proved guilty. It was an axiom that the Sanhedrin was to save, not to destroy life. No one could be tried and condemned in his absence. And when a person accused was brought before the court, it was the duty of the President, at the outset, to admonish the witnesses to remember the value of human life, and to take care they forgot nothing that would tell in the prisoner's favor. Nor was he left undefended; a 'Bal Rib' or counsel was appointed to see that everything possible was done for his acquittal. Whatever evidence tended to aid him was to be freely admitted, and no member of the court who

had once spoken in favor of acquittal could afterwards vote for condemnation. The votes of the youngest of the judges was taken first, that they might not be influenced by their seniors. In capital charges it required a majority of at least two to condemn, and while the verdict of acquittal could be given at once, that of guilty could not begin in the day preceding a Sabbath or public feast. No criminal trial could be carried through in the night; the judges who condemned any one to death had to fast all the day before, and no one could be executed on the same day on which the sentence was pronounced."

The trial of Jesus lasted a few hours, and the Jewish law required at least two days for capital trial—one for prosecution and one for defense.

On the way to execution a condemned man would be asked several times if he could think of anything not said in the evidence which might influence the judge in his favor. He also had the privilege of re-

turning to the court as often as he pleased with new pleas, with a herald preceding him, calling aloud: "This man is being led to execution; that is his crime . . . These are his witnesses. . . . If any one knows anything in his favor let him come forth and say so!"

CHAPTER IV

PONTIUS PILATE, the Roman procurator of Palestine, on whose will depended the life of Jesus, has been described by Josephus and Philo as an unprincipled tyrant, who had behaved most savagely toward the people of Jerusalem. He upheld the tradition of those governors who came to Palestine, a province of the Roman Empire, governors who exceeded one another in their tyranny and cruelty. On several occasions he came into conflict with the people of Jerusalem, and caused much bloodshed.

Pilate was the protege of the fanatical Sejanus, the favorite of Emperor Tiberius. Pilate was aware of Sejanus' antipathy toward the Jews, and he curried favor with Sejanus by treating the people of Jerusalem with systematic harshness.

An important sidelight of Pilate is given in a recent "Life of Christ," which says

that it was with "no little alarm that in the year 26 when the influence of Sejanus was at its height, the news spread that Valerius Gratus had at length been recalled and Pontius Pilate appointed in his stead. The client was worthy of his patron; venal, covetous, cruel even to the extent of shedding of blood, without conscience, without pity, his name soon became loathed in Judea. He acted offensively towards the people of Jerusalem. The garrison of Antonia had hitherto always left the insignia of their standards at the headquarters of Caesarea, since the Jews would not suffer the holy city to be profaned by the presence of the eagles, and the busts of the Emperor. But Pilate on the first change of the garrison, ordered the new regiments to enter the city by night with the objectionable emblems on the standards, and Jerusalem awoke to see the idolatrous symbols planted within sight of the Temple. Universal excitement spread through the city. The rabbis and the people met and deliberated how the

outrage could be removed. A multitude of citizens hurried off to Pilate at Caesarea, to entreat him to take away the cause of such bitter offence; but Pilate would not listen, and treated the request as an insult to the Emperor. . . . "

The foregoing incident throws a significant light upon the attitude of Jerusalem to Pilate and indicates how feared and hated Pilate was, as it also reveals the nature of the man before whom Jesus was finally brought.

In the Gospel of Luke we are told that Pilate massacred Galilean Jews in the Temple of Jerusalem, because they had dared to raise their voice against the tyranny of Rome. Jesus himself, to whom this massacre was reported, had expressed his sympathy for these patriots. (Luke XIII: 1)

Josephus records that "an impostor or pseudo-Messiah appeared at Samaria, and told the people that on Mount Gerizim, he would show them the sacred vessels of Moses, which were supposed to be buried

there. A large multitude of Samaritans, headed by their new Messiah, marched to the mountain. Unmerciful Pilate, with a strong body of horse and foot soldiers, interrupted the march, slew the greater part of the multitude in the first attack and dispersed the rest. Some were taken prisoners and put to death by order of Pilate. The Samaritans then sent a deputation to Vitellius, the proconsul of Syria, and complained of the violence of Pilate. Accordingly, Vitellius, in the year 37 C. E., sent Marcellus to Judea to take the office of procurator and ordered Pilate to Rome to answer the accusation which had been made against him."

On the Feast of the Passover, Pilate took up his quarters in Jerusalem, ostensibly to crush the incipient revolts.

The chief priests accused Jesus of "perverting the nation and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, saying that he is Christ, a King."

It must have been reported to the Roman

governor that Jesus was proclaimed by his followers "King of the Jews!" Pilate, therefore, ignored the Messiahship altogether, and concentrating upon the political aspect, asked Jesus: "Art thou the King of the Jews?"

Receiving a reply, "Thou sayest it," Pilate looked upon Jesus as a rebel against the Emperor Tiberius, and therefore (in accordance with Roman law) he condemned Jesus to death, delivered him to his soldiers to be scourged and crucified. According to Roman law the cross was the punishment inflicted upon robbers, murders and rebels. The crime for which the condemned man suffered was inscribed on the cross—that of treason.

It is not in accordance with Jewish law or practice to execute a condemned man on a festival, while from the Jewish point of view, crucifixion is an illegal method of executing the death penalty. Jesus was crucified by order of Pilate on the Feast of the Passover.

For some reason an attempt was made to exonerate the Roman governor and place the whole guilt upon the Jewish people. After Pilate accepted the charge against Jesus as "King of the Jews" and had it confirmed by Jesus himself, it proved beyond a doubt his guilt of high treason against Caesar.

The sentence should have been delivered and the trial closed. But we are told in Luke (XXIII: 4) that Pilate said to the enemies of Jesus: "I find no fault in this man."

The question at once suggests itself: How was it possible for a Roman governor, appointed over Palestine to look after the interests of Rome, to find no fault in a rebel against the Emperor? We must bear in mind that Palestine was a Roman province, and any pretender to the throne of David over a province of the Roman empire was "high treason to Caesar, the most awful crime to Roman law." To what purpose

then were the further questions and pleadings of the governor?

"Shall I crucify your king?" (John XIX: 15)

"Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews? Why, what evil hath he done? (Matthew XXVII: 23)

Let us imagine a modern parallel to this case.

There is an Irishman by the name of Parnell who is proclaimed King of Ireland. Parnell is arrested and brought before the British governor-general on a charge of stirring up the people and urging them not to pay taxes to the King, saying that he himself is King. The governor-general asks Parnell: "Are you the King of Ireland? And Parnell answers: "You said it." Then the governor-general politely replies: "I find no fault in this man. Why, what wrong has he done? Will you that I release the King of Ireland?"

One would think it incredible that a British governor-general would act dis-

loyally to king and country in defending an Irish rebel against his sovereign, and releasing him at once.

Yet, notwithstanding the evidence of the Gospel records that Jesus admitted to the Roman governor that he was king of the Jews, the average Christian has never asked himself why Pilate, as Roman governor of Palestine, defended a Jewish rebel against his emperor.

On the other hand, if Pilate found no fault in Jesus, why did he not release him? Why did he condemn him to the cross? The assertion that the Jews compelled the governor to crucify Jesus is not only preposterous but contradicts the statement of Pilate who said to Jesus: "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee and have the power to release thee?" (John XIX: 10)

Furthermore, why did Pilate deliver Jesus to his soldiers to have him scourged before the crucifixion? (Matthew XXVII: 26) The enemies of Jesus did not clamor for

scourging. They were not present, either in the judgment hall nor in the praetorian hall where Jesus was scourged and his lacerated body bled from the cruel lashes of the Roman soldiers.

That Pilate did condemn Jesus to be crucified for claiming to be the King of the Jews is evident from the brutal mockery of his soldiers, who dressed Jesus as a King, with a crown of thorns. The evangelists expressly state that the inscription upon the cross summed up all the accusations against Jesus. The inscription was JESUS NAZARENUS REX JUDAERUM (Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews).

"Then," says the Gospel, "the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers. And they stripped him and put on him a scarlet robe. And they had platted a crown of thorns which they put upon his head and a reed in his right hand. And they bowed the knee before him and mocked him saying, 'Hail, King of

the Jews!' And they spat upon him and took the reed and smote him on the head; and after they had mocked him, they took the robe from him and put his own raiment on him and led him away to crucify him."

Continuing the story Matthew says: "And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name, him they compelled to bear the cross. And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of skulls, they gave him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall. And when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink. And they crucified him. And set over his head his accusation written: 'This is Jesus, the King of the Jews.' "

According to Mark, "The superscription of his accusation was written over the king of the Jews."

Luke says, "And the soldiers also mocked him, saying 'If thou be the king of the Jews, save thyself.' And a superscription also written over him in letters of Greek

and Latin and Hebrew: 'This is the king of the Jews.' "

"And Pilate," says John, "wrote a title and put it on the cross and the writing was 'Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews' . . . and it was written in Hebrew and Greek and Latin. Then said the chief priests to Pilate, 'Write not the king of the Jews, but that he said, I am the king of the Jews.' Pilate answered, 'what I have written I have written.' "

In Luke's Gospel not only Pilate but Herod is reported to have tried Jesus and found him innocent. This Gospel relates that when Pilate found Jesus a Galilean, and therefore subject to the jurisdiction of Herod, he sent Jesus to the latter, who was himself at Jerusalem at that time. "And when Herod saw Jesus he was exceedingly glad; for he was desirous to see him of a long season, because he had heard many things of him; and he hoped to have seen some miracles done by him."

After a great deal of questioning, Herod

found Jesus free of any guilt, the story goes, and sent him back to Pilate.

The same Gospel speaks of "certain Pharisees" who "came to Jesus and said unto him: 'Get thee and depart for Herod will kill thee.' " (XII: 31) How was it possible that Herod should be "glad" to receive the same man whom he wanted to kill? On the other hand, if Herod was "exceedingly glad" to see Jesus and found no fault in him, although the latter refused to answer various questions, why did Herod not release him?

It was the same Herod who, according to the historian, Josephus (Antiquities, XVIII: 5, 2) put John the Baptist to death for purely political reasons.

"Now when many came in crowds about him, for they were greatly moved by hearing his words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion (for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise) thought it

best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause; and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late."

Prof. Vladimir Simkhovitch, in his "Towards a Better Understanding of Jesus" comments as follows on the foregoing passage:

"John the Baptist, therefore, according to the very plausible testimony of Josephus, was put to death for political reasons. What did John the Baptist do? He announced the coming of the Messiah. The Messiah, in the general and universal understanding of the time, was to be the deliverer of the Jews from Roman oppression. Herod, who had received his appointment as tetrarch of Galilee from Rome, was but an administrative instrument of his Roman sovereign. To him the coming of Christ could mean nothing but rebellion against Rome, under a leadership which the people would acclaim as divine. Whatever may have been the

flavor of John's religious and moral preachings, to Herod he was but the herald of a revolution, with great moral power over the people, who came to him in multitudes. Since the fate of the Herodians was tied up with the power of Rome, Herod put the precursor of what looked to him like the coming revolution, to death. To the Jewish populace, the Christ was the deliverer who was to come to deliver them from foreign rule and oppression. To a Herod or a Pilate, or any Roman administrative agent, the Christ who was to come was the leader of the expected rebellion. For what looked to the so-called Jewish patriot like deliverance, of course, meant rebellion to the forces of Rome.

"John was put to death by Herod for announcing the coming of the Christ. Yet when Pontius Pilate sent that very Christ to Herod, Herod did not put Him to death, but sent Him back to Pilate; and neither Pilate nor Herod could find any fault with Him. The Jews, on the other hand, who

were praying so fervently for the coming of the Christ, sought from Pilate Jesus' execution."

In other words, what we are asked to believe here is that the Herod who savagely put to death merely a precursor of Christ meekly sent Jesus away because he found no fault with him. We are asked to believe that it was the cry of the multitude which spelled Jesus' death, the cry of that multitude of Jews "who were praying so fervently for the coming of the Christ."

According to one account in the Gospel, Pilate is reported to have performed a Jewish ceremony in order to declare his innocence of having sent Jesus to the cross.

Matthew offers a rather anomalous story (XXVII: 22-26): "They all say unto him, 'Let him be crucified.' And the governor said, 'Why, what evil hath he done?' But they cried out all the more, saying 'Let him be crucified.' When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his

hands before the multitude, saying: 'I am innocent of the blood of this just person—see ye to it.' Then answered all the people, and said, his blood be on us and on our children. And when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified."

We are to believe, then, that this Roman tyrant who ruled the Jewish people with an iron hand, who at one time treacherously invited the Jews of Jerusalem to the circus and filled the arena with Roman soldiers for the express purpose of cutting the throat of each Jew, had suddenly been metamorphosed into a saint, and pleaded with the Jews to save the life of a Jew, although at the same time he made no attempt to release him, only talking about it.

When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing upon the obstinate Jews, that his pleading was in vain, he wanted to save the life of Jesus but was afraid to do so. Why? The reason is given that "a tumult was made." Thus, notwithstanding the presence of Roman soldiers, the governor be-

came nervous and yielded to the rabble. The tumult of the multitude must have been terrific, for Pilate's hands trembled, his knees shook, his face was ghastly pale. What a pathetic figure Pilate must have appeared to the victorious multitude who merely by raising a "tumult" had prevailed upon a representative of Caesar, to whom mercy was an unknown quality, to crucify a Jew.

Finally a basin of water was placed before Pilate. The Roman governor is described washing his hands like a good, pious Jew, saying to the multitude: "I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye it." This freed him of all responsibility and the crowd is alleged to have responded in imitation of a Biblical text: "His blood be on us and on our children."

To the theologian the above incident represents a conflict between "Roman justice and obstinate Jews," whose lust for blood had triumphed over Roman justice. But to the impartial critic it is obvious that the

author of this has stated a deliberate falsehood.

In the first place, it was not at all necessary to *urge* the Roman governor to crucify Jesus, after he was found guilty of treason against Caesar. Jesus was not the first Jew whom Pilate crucified, for lesser crimes than claiming to be the King of the Jews. The governor was only too pleased to execute a rebel against Caesar.

Secondly, the washing of hands and the declaration of innocence is exclusively a Jewish custom. Deuteronomy (XXI: 6-9) says: "And the elders of the city shall come to the slain, and shall wash their hands and shall say, Our hands did not shed the blood —and thou shalt be free of the innocent blood that was shed."

Is it reasonable to suppose that a Roman official who had the utmost contempt for the Jews and to whom the Jewish religion was a conglomeration of the vilest superstitions would have adopted a Jewish custom? Did the Roman governor wash his hands

and declare his innocence when he "mingled the blood of the Galilean Jews with their sacrifices?" Did Pilate wash his hands and declare his innocence after he had commanded his soldiers to kill many Jews of Jerusalem and many of the Samaritans?

It was out of hatred for the Jews and flattery to the Romans that the Evangelist made Pilate wash his blood-stained hands and declare his innocence, and that all the Jews said to Pilate: "Let him be crucified," and "his blood be on us and on our children."

Assuming that there was a crowd of Jews and Jewesses surrounding the Roman court, who is to say that every Jew and Jewess in the crowd answered: "Let him be crucified." "His blood be on us."

Besides, there must have been present at the trial the friends, relatives, admirers and sympathizers of Jesus. Did they answer and say: "Let him be crucified. His blood be on us?" Did this come from the followers of Jesus who only five days before

spread their garments before him and greeted their Messiah with shouts of "Hosannah to the son of David. Blessed is the king of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Luke says that "All the (Jewish) people that came together to that sight, beholding the things which were done, smote their breasts."

Then there were in the crowd the disciples, the mother of Jesus, and his four brothers, James, Joses, Judas and Simon. Did they answer and say: "Let him be crucified. His blood be on us and on our children?"

In the third place, if the passage saying: "Let him be crucified" is a reproduction of a true incident, why is it not recorded in the other Gospels? The author of the Gospel of Mark, the oldest of all the Gospels, has nothing to say in this regard. Luke agrees with the statement of the other Gospels that Pilate pronounced sentence of death and delivered Jesus to his soldiers to

be crucified. Although he does his very best to clear the governor of the crucifixion and to intensify the guilt of the Jews, not even he mentions a word about Pilate washing his hands or the Jews pronouncing a curse upon themselves.

"Pilate," says this Gospel, "willing to release Jesus spoke again to them. But they cried out saying: 'Crucify him, crucify him.' And he said unto them the third time, 'why, what evil hath he done? I have found no cause of death in him. I will therefore chastise him and let him go.' And they were insistent with loud voices urging that he might be crucified. And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed. And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required."

Although John exceeds the other Gospel stories in depicting the magnanimity and compassion of Pilate, and the blood-thirstiness of the Jews, he goes to the extent of saying that the Jews threatened the governor if he dared release Jesus, who declared

himself a king. He adds another falsehood by saying that "Pilate delivered Jesus to the Jews to have him crucified." Even John has no story about the governor washing his hands or the Jews vociferating: "His blood be on us." On the contrary this account of the trial declares that the Jews who clamored for the death of Jesus consisted of "the chief priests and officers."

John's version of Jesus' appearance before Pilate runs as follows: "Pilate therefore went forth again and said unto them: 'Behold, I bring him forth to you that ye may know that I find no fault in him.' When the chief priests and officers saw him they cried out, saying: 'Crucify him, crucify him.' And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him. But the Jews cried out, saying 'If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend. Whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar.' When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth and sat down in the judgment seat in a place that is called

the Pavement. But in the Hebrew, Gabbatha.

"And it was the preparation of the Passover and about the sixth hour. And he saith unto the Jews: 'Behold your king!' But they cried out: 'Away with him, away with him, crucify him.' Pilate saith unto them, 'Shall I crucify your king?' The chief priests answered: 'We have no king but Caesar.' Then delivered he him therefore unto them to be crucified. And they took Jesus and led him away."

Some theologians in their attempts to harmonize the Gospels have glossed over the numerous contradictions in the accounts of the trial by stating that the reason for the omission of the Jewish trial in the Gospel according to John, or the omission of the night trial in the Gospel according to Luke, or the omission of any other passage, is that it is recorded in another Gospel. But that this is untrue is affirmed by Luke in the introductory verses of his Gospel:

"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of these things which are most surely believed among us. Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, it seems good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of these things wherein thou has been instructed."

In the fourth place, the story of the washing of Pilate's hands, etc., could not have been written by Matthew because his original compilation, which he wrote in Aramaic, a dialect of Hebrew, contained only the Logia, discourses of Jesus. The account of the trial was written in Greek by an unknown person many years after the death of Jesus. This is confirmed by the writer himself in the twenty-seventh chapter in which he relates that Judas repented of betraying his Master, and returned the

thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests. "And they took council and bought with them the potter's field to bury the strangers. Wherefore that field was called 'the field of blood' unto this day." (Matthew XXVII: 7-8)

The last three words, 'unto this day,' and Luke's statement: "Even as they delivered them unto us" prove beyond a doubt that the accounts of the trial, whether in Matthew's Gospel or in the other Gospels were not written by eye-witnesses. The headings of each Gospel, "according to St. Mark," "according to St. Matthew," "according to St. Luke," "according to St. John," show that they were written according to the traditions of the Evangelists.

Moreover, for the first three centuries the four Gospels were not considered authentic by Christians, but apocryphal. The four Gospels were selected in the fourth century as canonical by the Council of Nicaea.

To whatever source of information one

turns, one finds that Jesus himself never wrote a line of all that is taught in the New Testament, that not a scrap of his writing of any kind has ever been found or has ever been known to exist.

Not a word concerning his sayings and doings was known to have existed in writing before well nigh two generations had passed after his death.

Not a sketch, however brief, is extant for which a date can be assigned much earlier than the close of the first century.

Not a line of his life was transmitted to us from any of his disciples who loved and toiled with him. Of all the words recorded in the four Gospels as having been spoken by Jesus, Paul, who entered upon his public career after the death of Jesus, and who was a voluminous writer, quotes but a single phrase, the one in connection with the commemoration of the Last Supper. (Cor. I: 11, 25)

It is evident from a comparison of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. John that

the older the story of Jesus the simpler it is, the freer from the supernatural, the friendlier to the Jew; and that the further removed the story is from the lifetime of Jesus the more elaborate, complicated, christological, it becomes, and the more hostile it grows toward the Jews.

A fact far-reaching in its significance is to be borne in mind at this point. Both the Nazarenes and the Ebionites, the former representing the personal disciples of Jesus, and counting among themselves members of his family, the latter being of the second generation, children or converts of those who had walked and talked with him, and counting among themselves descendants of his family, speak of Jesus as one who was human born, one who lived and died a Jew in profession and practice. Neither of these, who were closest to their Master, had the slightest knowledge of the charge that was trumped up by later pagan propagandists that the Jews persecuted Jesus and that

they had not rested until they had nailed him to the cross.

The Ebionites had a Gospel of their own. This is the earliest mention of a Gospel. Its date was probably the beginning of the second century. Judging from the fragments that have survived it probably contained a sketch of the life of Jesus and a collection of his "Sayings," which, like the collection of "Sayings" of other rabbis of that day, had been cherished and transmitted by his disciples.

From that time Gospels sprang up everywhere (there is a record of some fifty of them), differing considerably from each other in the accounts they give of the life and teaching of the Nazarene, and, at times, contradicting each other in very essential points.

The different contents of these various gospels were becoming so confusing and contradictory that Bishop Papias, who lived about the middle of the second century, declared that no reliance at all was to be

placed in the written gospels, that the only way of learning the truth about Jesus was to accost such men as had known old men, who, in their youth, had personal relationship with the Master.

The story of Jesus was distorted to satisfy the theological requirements of the people to whom it was brought. Bishop Irenaeus (185 C. E.) complained of theologians who "with great craftiness adapt parts of scriptures to their theories . . . adopt the oracle of God on their baseless fictions by violently drawing away from their proper connecting words, expressions and parables wherever found." But in the end he did the very thing of which he complained in others.

There was no historical conscience at the time. The literature of the missionaries was what the Germans call "Tendenz-Literature," literature with a special end in view. They saw nothing incongruous in the method they adopted. If it was a fraud, it was a pious fraud.

There is not a word to be found in Paul's authentic writings of the Jews having persecuted and crucified Jesus. What better authority than that this charge was a base invention, seeing that he lived the first twenty years of his life contemporaneously with Jesus.

But his knowledge of Jesus and Judaism was not that of his successors. Far removed from Palestine, without knowledge of Hebrew, or rabbinical laws and institutions, even of Palestinian geography, they tell of Jews having said and done things that contradict every known law of Israel. They elaborate upon trial proceedings such as might have taken place before a magistrate at Rome, but never before a Judean Sanhedrin. They speak of two high priests when there was never more than one at a time. They have a trial on the night of the Passover, when no court session could be held. They try cases involving capital punishment at night, which is contrary to Jewish law. They have Jesus accused and

condemned to death for holding different religious opinions, when Essenes, Sadducees and Pharisees held radically different religious opinions with impunity.

But there was a reason for all these inventions. And there was a reason for the thirty long years of silence that stretch between the year of the birth of Jesus and the year of his death. These thirty years told of his Jewish life and aspirations. They told of his discipleship under Pharisean masters. They told of his ambition and attempt to emancipate Judea from the hand of the cruel Roman. And that record had to be expunged even at the expense of leaving in the life story of Jesus a gap that is as astounding as it is unfortunate.

CHAPTER V

THE various armed uprisings of Judea against Rome and the unyielding opposition of the Jews and of the Jewish Christians to the liberties the Gentile Christians were taking with the Galilean prophet and patriot, and with the Hebrew Scriptures intensified the hatred of the successors of Paul, who were more devoted Romans than missionaries.

Conditions obtained which in the eyes of the missionaries made hatred of the Jews even a necessity. Some of the persecutions meted out to them were a result of their being classed with the Jews. Emperor Hadrian's interdiction of the practice of Judaism in the whole of Judea on the pain of death (135 C. E.), and his persecution of the Jews in the Roman provinces made it politic for the Gentile Christians to sever every bond between themselves and

the Jews, and to make public manifestations that their faith had nothing in common with that of the Jews. They were followers of Christ but Christ no longer was a Judean but a Deity. They substituted Sunday for the Saturday Sabbath, and Resurrection Day for the Passover.

The bridge from Judaism to Christianity was destroyed by Gentile converts, and thus was introduced between the old and the new, a chasm which grew the wider and deeper as the centuries advanced. To make the severance more complete they reconstructed the Gospel story in a manner so cruel to the Jews that the like of it has probably never been equalled before or since.

"All his (Jesus) people," says Papini, "wished to pierce his flesh with nails, but only a foreigner, an idolater (Pilate), defended his life. He had not succeeded in persuading the tigerish and mulish people of the innocence of their wretched king. What they wanted was to see a little blood

on these festival days, wanted to enjoy the spectacle of a crucifixion."

What Papini has done in his "Life of Christ" is merely a reflection of the attitude adopted by Christians for nineteen centuries. A noted Christian divine, Rev. Robinson Lees, of London, re-echoes the sentiments of a great portion of contemporary Christianity, in his "Life of Christ."

"Once they had been roused, nothing appeased their lust for blood. Washing his hands before them, Pilate said: 'I am innocent of the blood of this just person, see ye to it!' He declared himself free from all responsibility. Then all the people answered and said: 'His blood be on us and on our children!' "

"No words," says the London pastor, "ever brought such retribution as this wild and passionate expression of hate. They had forgotten for the moment the full meaning of their responsibility, or they imagined that it would be possible to escape from it because there was no one to take

vengeance for the blood that was shed. Since that fateful day when Christ was condemned for saying He was the Son of God, His blood has stained the Jewish name. The race has been haunted by their deed, and a terrible retribution has followed their cry. It cannot be denied that there is nothing in the world's history to compare with the results of the world's tragedy. Wherever a Jew had been found, whether quietly pursuing his calling in the market place of civilization, or fleeing from its persecution, the blood-guiltiness of the Jewish fathers has been remembered in their children. A prejudice has grown in the hearts of men who have not known anything personally against the Jews, who have not been even personally acquainted with them, a prejudice which cannot be charged to the account of those in whom the inherent feelings exist without reference to the blood that was shed. The cry of the infuriated Jews has reverberated down the corridors of the ages, and even men who have heard

only the rudiments of their story shrink from contact with the haunted race. Time has not wiped out their deed nor has history erased it. On the darkest pages of the annals of mankind it remains as if it had been recorded in letters of blood for all men to read for ever. It accelerated the doom then fast approaching of the people compelled by their own act to tread a blood stained road conspicuous by the mark upon them that stained their name."

A question arises, which several have attempted to answer, but unsuccessfully. If "God has sent His only-begotten Son to save the world from sin" and Christians went to the length of burning alive thousands of Jews for refusing to accept Jesus as "Saviour and Redeemer"—granted that the Jews did crucify the "Saviour and Redeemer," they were only the instruments of the Almighty carrying out His will—why, however, should there be "vengeance for the blood that was shed" to save the world from sin? Why should "the blood

guiltiness of the Jewish fathers be remembered in their children?" Why should "the cry of the infuriated Jews reverberate down the corridors of the ages?" Why should the Christian "shrink from contact with the haunted race" for having sacrificed one of their own bone and flesh in order to save him from everlasting damnation and wash all his sins away? Why shouldn't "Time wipe out their deed" and "history erase it," since "their deed" was done by the express command of God, as an atonement for the sins of mankind? To what purpose do millions of Christians chant on every Sunday "For me, for me, He died for me?" Why sing "His precious blood He shed for me" if the Jews are "compelled to thread a bloodstained road?"

Yet how usual it is for innumerable preachers to relate to men and women with bated breath the dramatic story from the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel according to John. How the Roman governor presented the King of the Jews to his peo-

ple, "wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe," his body lacerated from the strokes of the Roman instruments of torture. "Pilate thinking," says the preacher, "the compassion of the people might be aroused and grant him the liberty to release the Messianic King; but the stubborn Jews were unmoved at the sight of 'the pale and bleeding prisoner.' And their deafening shouts, 'crucify him, crucify him' break the heart of the merciful but helpless Pilate who reluctantly submits to their bloodthirsty demand." Then with what vengeance the preacher of the Gospel sits in judgment upon "the God-killing people."

It is this type of sermon preached by the priests of Czarist Russia that incensed the holy orthodox Christians to make pogroms upon the Russian Jews, in order to "kill the Christ-killers," to avenge the death of their saviour.

Thus for a crime which was perpetrated by a Roman governor and a Jewish high

priest (appointed by the governor) a whole nation was made responsible and condemned to suffer for fifteen centuries. If Pilate had had to wash his hands of all the Jewish blood he had shed during the ten years of his term of office, there would not have been enough water in Jerusalem.

"Jews massacred in France," "Jews massacred in Spain," "Jews massacred in England," "Jews massacred in Germany." These are the headlines that stare one in the face, as one reads the history of the Jews in Christian Europe.

"These headings," says Abbot, a non-Jew, in his book "Israel in Europe," "not to mention expulsions, oppressions and spoliations without number, stare us in the face as we turn over the pages of history of medieval Europe, and the cold lines assume a terrible significance as we pursue tale after tale of bodily and mental torments such as no other people ever suffered and survived."

The Roman Emperor, Constantine, be-

fore his conversion treated the Jews as being on a footing of equality with other subject nations; but when he embraced the Christian religion in 323 C. E., his tolerance ceased.

"It is unjust," declared the first Christian emperor in one of his anti-Jewish decrees, "that those who are freed by the blood of Christ should be slaves to the murderers of the Son of God."

"The Jews," says one of the fathers of the Church, St. John Chrysostum, in one of his anti-Jewish sermons, "have crucified the Son and rejected the Holy Ghost, and their souls are the abode of the devil. They are wretches, dogs, bull-headed, their people are like a herd of brutes, like wild beasts; avoid them! It is not insignificant controversies that separate us but the death of Christ."

Pope Innocent III, who was the most fierce enemy of the Jews, wrote to the Archbishop of Sens, and to the Bishop of Paris, reminding them that "the Jews were bound by perpetual subjugation, because of

the crucifixion." It was the same Pope who first confined the Jews in Ghettos and prescribed for them a special dress, the yellow patch on the breast and a yellow headcovering in order to distinguish them from the Christian. Jews were forbidden to show themselves on the street on Easter, because their presence was an insult to Christianity.

At Toulouse, France, on every Good Friday, the Christian mayor gave the president of the Jewish community a box on the ear, his example being followed by his fellow Christians. The Jews appealed to the King against this and other acts of oppression; and he answered that "they only suffered the penalties due to their sins."

In Baziers, France, from Palm Sunday till Easter, the Jews were pelted with stones, a sermon from the Bishop being the usual prelude to the commencement of hostilities. "You have around you," said the Bishop to his flock, "those who crucified the Messiah, who deny Mary, the mother of God. Now is the time when you should feel most deep-

ly the injury of which Christ was the victim. This is a day on which our Prince has graciously given us permission to avenge his crime. Like your pious ancestors, hurl stones at the Jews, and show your sense of Christ's wrong by the vigor with which you resent them." This practice went on year after year, until Bishop Raymond caused it to be stopped in lieu of an annual payment of four pounds of silver to be paid by the Jews on every Palm Sunday.

"How many Jews," says Leroy-Beaulieu in his "Israel Among the Nations," "have been burned in the Middle Ages for having crucified Christ by puncturing with their pen knife a consecrated wafer. This, however, is one of those fables which bear on their face the evidence of falsity. A Jew who believes neither in the divinity of Christ nor in the fact that the wafer screens his invisible presence is not apt from mere curiosity to pierce that wafer in order to see if blood will flow from it. Such sacri-

lege could originate only in a Christian brain."

In the eleventh century, when the Crusaders were on their way to drive the Saracens out of Palestine, they were incited by the clergy to attack the Jews.

"While we are advancing," said they, "to rescue the sepulchre of our Redeemer, we are leaving behind us the murderers of our Lord. Let us be revenged upon the Jews that are among us, and prevent them from being a nation, so that the name of Israel be had no more in remembrance."

At Treves, when the Jews heard that the holy army was approaching, some of them were so terrified that they killed their own children and drowned themselves in order to escape the ruthlessness of the Crusaders. Others fled into the Bishop's palace, vainly imploring him to protect them.

The atrocities of the first Crusade were repeated in the second. Peter, the venerated Abbot of Clugny, exerted himself to influence Louis VII and other prominent

Crusaders against the Jews. "Of what use is it," he wrote to the King, "to go forth to seek the enemies of the Christians in the distant lands, if the blasphemous Jews, who are much worse than the Saracens, are permitted in our very midst to scoff with impunity at Christ and the Sacrament? Yet, I do not request you to put to death these accursed beings, but like Cain the fratricide they must be made to suffer fearful torments, and kept in reserve for greater ignominy and an existence more bitter than death."

Rudolf, a monk, had been going up and down the Rhineland preaching, with tears in his eyes, that all Jews who were found by the Crusaders should be slain as the "murderers of our dear Lord." The cry "Hep, hep," the signal for the massacre of the Jews, rang through the cities of the Rhine, and "Jew Roaster" became a title of honor.

From Germany the frenzy passed to France.

England too was then swarming with

friars preaching the Crusade. At the coronation of Richard I, the Jews were massacred in London and all the principal cities. "The clergy," says a Christian writer, "were, as usual, foremost in the work of intolerance; they scrupled not to go in their vestments, at the head of the crowd, exhorting them to take unpitying vengeance. One dignitary in particular, a canon regular, distinguished himself above all; he stood in the midst of the ferocious multitude clothed in his surplice, continually urging the assault with vehement shouts: 'Destroy the enemies of Christ! Destroy the enemies of Christ!' Day after day found this furious priest at his self-selected post with unabated zeal directing the attack. The besieged, on the advice of their rabbi, killed their wives and children and then prepared to consign the castle and themselves into flames. The King's officers found themselves powerless to prevent or punish."

In the war between the Hussites and the

Roman Catholics, the German Imperial Army when on its march to Bohemia excited its valor by attacking the defenseless Jews. "We are marching afar," they said, "to avenge our insulted God, and shall those who slew him be spared?" The Jews again paid the penalty.

CHAPTER VI

At the approach of the Easter holidays in Czarist Russia, 6,000,000 Jews trembled in fear of being massacred, because the priests preached in the churches that "the Jews crucified the Son of God." The priests warned the Christians to guard their children before the Passover, because the Jews would kill them and use their blood for their Passover cakes.

A vivid description of brotherly love during the Russian pogroms in the second year of the reign of Emperor Alexander III is given by Victor Hugo. When Alexander was asked the reasons for the pogroms, he answered frankly: "They crucified our Lord."

In the New York Tribune of July 4, 1882, Hugo writes: "What we are now witnessing is more than crime. It is monstrous. A people has become a monster. Horrible

phenomenon. A curtain seems to have been rent asunder. While a voice says, Humanity, look and behold! Two solutions are before thine eyes. On one side man is advancing slowly but surely towards a more luminous horizon. On the other side, man is retrograding, the horizon is blacker than ever, the multitude feels its way in darkness. Christianity is martyrizing Judaism. Thirty cities at this very moment are a prey to pillage and exterminations. Passing events in Russia inspire horror. In that country an immense crime is being committed, or rather such an action is taking place. For these exterminating populations are not conscious of crime; their worship has sunk them into bestiality. They have the fearful innocence of the tiger, of past centuries—of the Albigenses, of the Inquisition of the Holy Office, of the St. Bartholomew—are rushing on the nineteenth and seeking to strangle it. Emasculation of man, violation of woman, destruction of the child. It is the future suppressed. The past will not

die, and holds humanity fast. On one side the people; on the other, the crowd! On one side light; on the other gloom."

Forty-five years have passed since these words were written. How many time since then have we seen the Dark Ages rushing on the twentieth century, and seeking to strangle it? How many times have we seen in Holy Orthodox Russia Christians leaving their Churches, carrying aloft the cross and the images of the Crucified Jew and of his Jewish mother, rushing to the Jewish quarters, outraging the women, massacring the men, tearing the suckling babes into halves and flinging them at the mutilated bosoms of their dead mothers? And the priests stood in front of their victims, with golden crosses on their breasts. Is it surprising that the sight of the cross or the name of Christ makes a Russian Jew shudder?

Even dignitaries of the Church of England, who are presumed to be more enlightened than the Russian, Polish and Ru-

manian priests, regard the Jews through medieval spectacles.

"The thoughts of the season" said the Bishop of Stepney on a Good Friday, "would be incomplete unless we give a place to those whose rejection of their own Messiah has been the great tragedy of history."

"That was the return for the crucifixion of our Lord and Master," said Bishop Weldon on a similar occasion at Westminster Abbey. "The Jews gave Him strife and encompassed his death. We gave them sanctuary and kindness without one word of reproach."

It was very kind of the Bishop of Stepney to give a place to those wicked Jews who rejected their own Messiah.

Notwithstanding the fact that it is nearly nineteen hundred years since Jesus died on the cross, Bishop Weldon has not the least doubt that the Jews of England "encompassed his death."

Jesus prayed on the cross to forgive those

who crucified him. "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." Bishop Weldon, following the footsteps of his Lord and Master, also prayed to forgive the English Jews. For they knew not what they were doing.

Jesus teaches to return good for evil. "The Jews (of England) gave him strife and encompassed his death." Bishop Weldon "gave them sanctuary and kindness without one word of reproach."

Such a display of benevolence, generosity, forgiveness, and nobility of character had surely gained him the gratitude of every Jew in England. Bishop Weldon has proved himself to be a paragon of virtue.

The Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem recently discovered that a New York rabbi crucified Jesus. And unlike Bishop Weldon, Bishop MacInnes was not as generous and forgiving, when he stood face to face with the murderer of Christ, and asked him, "who was he whom you crucified?" Had the slayer of Jesus been an orthodox rabbi, the

Bishop's indictment would have caused no surprise, but that a reformed rabbi of the radical wing should have nailed Jesus to the cross was certainly a startling discovery.

The meeting of the bishop with the rabbi was very dramatic. When Bishop MacInnes came to this country in 1924, he visited the home of a New York rabbi, reports "Bible Lands," and was astonished to see in the drawing room pictures from the life of Jesus. "I see you are interested in my pictures," said the rabbi.

"I expect you are surprised to find pictures from the life of Christ in a Jewish rabbi's home."

"It is very surprising to me," said the Anglican bishop. "Tell me what it means."

Being well known as an ardent admirer of Jesus, the rabbi showered upon him the highest praise, saying, "he was the greatest Jew who ever lived." But it made no impression upon the bishop. "That," said he, "I can understand entirely." The Bishop evidently was not in the mood to appreciate

the rabbi's tribute to his Lord and Master, or the honor conferred upon Christ in a rabbi's home. There was something on his mind that was not at all complimentary to the rabbi. He wanted to know why a Jewish rabbi should adorn his walls with pictures from the life of Christ whom he crucified.

"What beats me," exclaimed the bishop, "are these pictures of the Crucifixion! Why have pictures of the Crucifixion? Who was he whom you crucified?"

The last sentence shows clearly that the rabbi, though acclaimed by Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, as "the best Christian in New York" has to face the charge of a more serious crime than Professor Margolies. The latter was only reproached for rejecting Jesus, whereas the rabbi was accused of crucifying him. Furthermore, it is obvious that Bishop MacInnes was quite original in his indictment, for he did not accuse all the Jews of killing Christ, as is customary among Christians, but only the rabbi.

14370

Being conscious of his innocence of killing Jesus, in view of the fact that he was not even in Jerusalem at the time of the crucifixion, the rabbi was quite surprised. After a few moments, the rabbi recovered from the shock. Looking very grave, he explained to the Bishop in a heart-to-heart talk that it was the high priest Caiaphas who nailed Jesus to the cross. "There are bad men in every age," said the rabbi in a voice vibrating with emotion. "Caiaphas was a bad man. We have suffered for his iniquity ever since."

The Bishop listened with the utmost attention, but stuck to his original indictment. In other words, he still believed in the rabbi's guilt. Then he gazed at the picture of the Crucifixion, and upon observing the red color on the pierced side of his Saviour and Redeemer, he pressed his lips tightly together. The rabbi could not have failed to discern from the stern look what was passing through the Bishop's mind.

Poor rabbi, with all his display of pic-

tures from the life of Christ, with all his ecstatic praise, veneration and love of Jesus, with all his striking evidence against Caiaphas as the slayer of Christ, with all the eloquence of his brilliant defence which would have convinced a Nero of his innocence, was not cleared of the crime of Calvary, nor could he soften the heart of his relentless accuser.

Yet it is inconceivable that Bishop MacInnes, notwithstanding his medieval mind, would ignore the Gospel records, and the statement of the Roman historian, Tacitus, that Pontius Pilate crucified Jesus in the first century.

We should bear in mind that Anglican Bishops or gloomy Deans do not juggle with words, nor slander the Jews just for the fun of the thing. Their record in the present as in the past shows that they mean precisely what they say. When the Right Rev. and the Right Honorable Arthur Falley Winnington Ingram, the Lord Bishop of London, stated that "there can be no greater

obstacles to Christianity than to have Palestine full of unconverted Jews," he meant what he said. Although the learned Bishop was evidently ignorant of the fact that the unconverted Jews are not Hottentots, and believed in the religion of Jesus or the Christianity of Christ long before the Lord Bishop's ancestors were taught to believe in the religion about Jesus or the Christ of Christianity.

A little light on the entity of the Jew is shed by Count Leo Tolstoy in one of his volumes.

"Let us see" said Count Leo Tolstoy" what kind of peculiar creature the Jew is, whom all the rulers and all the nations have together and separately abused and molested, oppressed and persecuted, trampled and butchered—and in spite of all this is yet alive. What is a Jew, who has never allowed himself to be led astray by all the earthly possessions which his oppressors constantly offered him in order that he should change his faith and forsake his own religion?

"The Jew is that sacred being who has brought down from heaven the everlasting fire, and has illumined with it the entire world. He is the religious source, spring and fountain out of which all the rest of the peoples have drawn their beliefs and their religions.

"The Jew is the pioneer of liberty. Even in these olden days when the people were divided into but two distinct classes, slaves and masters—even so long ago had the law of Moses prohibited the practice of keeping a person in bondage for more than six years.

"The Jew is the pioneer of civilization. Ignorance was condemned in olden Palestine more even than it is today in civilized Europe. Moreover, in those wild and barbarous days, where neither life nor death of any one counted for nothing at all, Rabbi Akibba, did not refrain from expressing himself openly against capital punishment, a practice, which is recognized to-day as a highly civilized way of punishment.

"The Jew is the emblem of civil and re-

ligious toleration. 'Love the stranger and the sojourner,' Moses commands, 'because you have been strangers in the land of Egypt!' And this was said in those remote and savage times, when the principal ambition of the races and nations consisted in crushing and enslaving one another. As concerns religious tolerations. The Jewish faith is not only far from a missionary spirit of converting people of other denominations, but on the contrary, the Talmud commands the rabbis to inform and explain to everybody who willingly comes to accept the Jewish religion, all the difficulties involved in its acceptance, and to point out to the would-be proselyte that the righteous of all nations have a share in immortality: Of such a lofty and ideal religious toleration not even the moralist of our present day can boast.

"The Jew is the emblem of eternity. He whom neither slaughter nor torture of thousands of years could destroy, he whom neither fire nor sword nor inquisition was

unable to wipe off from the face of the earth, he who has been for so long a time the guardian of prophecy, and who transmitted it to the rest of the world—such a nation cannot be destroyed. He is everlasting as is eternity itself."

"For the whole conversion process," said Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, in a sermon, "I have nothing but horror and disgust. It is to my mind an insult to the intelligence and character of the race that many of our Christian churches should be conducting regular missions for the Jews, as though these Jews forsooth, were some kind of heathens, to be saved from everlasting damnation. For my part I would ask for nothing better than the Jews should remain Jews and Christians Christians, with the single exception that I would have these two great branches of the human family come together in a closer affiliation of the Spirit that they now enjoy."

EPILOGUE

A Christian negro who presumably had neither the education nor intelligence of the numerous high churchmen mentioned in this little sketch, remarked to me after listening to my address on "The Trial of Christ": "Mistah Hindenburg, it makes no difference to me who killed Christ. So long as he died for me I am perfectly satisfied."

THE END

LUTHERAN SEMINARY LIBRARY, MAYWOOD, ILL.

BM620.H8
Hünterberg

The crucified Jew

14970

DATE	ISSUED TO
AUG 14 1959	J. A. Schu AUG 21 1959

BM620
.H8
Library Bureau Cat. no. 1174

14970

T3-BUN-507